

MINUTES

CITY PLAN COMMISSION/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

JUNE 21, 2010

**JOINT MEETING BETWEEN  
CITY PLAN COMMISSION & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT  
ADVISTORY COMMITTEE (EDAC)**

Upon roll call, the following responded:

Plan Commission Members Present:

Chairman Harold Sanger  
Steve Lichtenfeld, Aldermanic Representative  
Craig S. Owens, City Manager  
Jim Liberman  
Marc Lopata  
Scott Wilson  
Ron Reim

Plan Commission Members Absent:

None

EDAC Members Present:

Chairman Gary Krosch  
Claire Halpern  
Julie Muller  
Rick Hummel  
Vic Frankel

EDAC Members Absent:

Charles Farris  
Elisa Wang  
Louis Copilevitz  
Richard Yawitz

Also Present:

Judy Goodman, Alderman  
Alex Berger, Alderman

Gary Carter, Economic Developer  
Jason Jaggi, Acting Director of Planning & Development Services  
Brian Malone, Acting City Attorney

Chairman Sanger welcomed everyone to the meeting. He asked that all cell phone ringers be turned off or muted and that conversations take place outside the room so as not to disrupt the meeting.

## PRESENTATION OF DRAFT UPDATE TO CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT MASTER PLAN

Presentation by Sasaki Associates of the Final Draft of the update to the City's Business District Master Plan.

Fred Merrill with Sasaki Associates and Tom Moriarity with AECOM were in attendance.

Craig Owens announced that this joint meeting, while unusual, is being held so that the City's consultant, Sasaki, can present the draft plan, which is an update to the 1993 Plan which provides guidance for land use decisions for years to come, provides guidance for infrastructure to include public spaces and provides guidance for economic development.

Mr. Merrill thanked the City for the opportunity to present this plan; he stated they have come a long way since the inception of this project. He reiterated that this is meant to update the 1993 Plan and serve as a decision making tool. He indicated that the title of the document has been changed from "CBD Master Plan" to "Downtown Master Plan" to reflect quality urbanism. He stated that it is his hope that this document will serve Clayton for years to come. He stated that this is not a sustainability plan; however sustainability is addressed/acknowledged in the document.

Mr. Merrill began a PowerPoint presentation. Slides depicting existing and proposed/new buildings as well as potential future developments were presented. Mr. Merrill indicated that the Plan establishes six (6) districts (North Central, Forsyth Village, Park View, Central Station, Maryland Gateway and Meramec Gateway) and allows for mixed-use developments in areas where they may occur. A brief explanation and slide of each proposed district was presented – North Central will focus on low-rise restaurant row and nearby mid-rise office buildings; Forsyth Village will emphasize on TOD and a transition area to adjacent neighborhoods; Park View calls for high and mid-rise buildings on the eastern and northern edges of Shaw Park that will capitalize on the exceptional views of the Park; Central Station's proximity to the Clayton MetroLink station has the potential for housing infill development; Maryland Gateway calls for a low-rise corridor mixed-use that will serve as a gateway from the west and Meramec Gateway combines smaller scale offices, residential and services that step-down toward the surrounding neighborhoods.

Mr. Moriarity made reference to the Galleria, stating that the owner knows each tenant very well which is not the case in downtown Clayton. He stated there needs to be incentives to get and retain businesses.

Mr. Merrill asked for questions and/or comments.

Chairman Sanger asked if they looked into one-way streets for north/south traffic. He indicated that he is not advocating this, but simply asking.

Mr. Merrill stated that they did not look into that in detail as they believe 2-way streets are better and that rush hour in Clayton seems relatively short.

Mr. Moriarity added that although he is not a transportation engineer, he has heard that one-way streets create more drive miles.

Chairman Sanger commented that a lot of emphasis was placed on housing, which he thinks is terrific. He stated that some cities require developers to include/add affordable housing and asked the consultants to comment on that.

Mr. Merrill stated that market rate rental rates are absent in downtown Clayton. He stated that there is an established land value and is more urbanized than University City.

Steve Lichtenfeld commented that the draft Plan projects 13,000 to 45,000 square foot of unmet retail demand in the year 2014. He mentioned that Centene would use up 50% of that figure.

Mr. Moriarity advised the members that Centene's square footage was not included in that range. He stated that there are 35,000 office workers in Clayton and new residents with disposable income.

Marc Lopata referred to comments he sent to Jason, stating that the City is vocal about wanting high performance buildings, but that is not addressed in the Plan.

Mr. Merrill commented that they could do a better job acknowledging that; however, those types of studies are very detailed and would urge the City to conduct another study. He added that he is aware that the City adopted LEED requirements for public buildings.

Mr. Moriarity indicated that they focused on the economics/sustainability side. He stated that people do want high performance spaces.

Steve Lichtenfeld questioned if Clayton's average age is lower than that of the County as the Plan indicates.

Mr. Moriarity replied “no”, stating that all new information they have gathered contradicts that statement and that Clayton’s average age is actually closer to the regional average, which will be reflected in the final report.

Steve Lichtenfeld questioned if maybe the Wash U students ages were included, deriving at the younger figure.

Ron Reim mentioned parking and stated that parking is a bit topic for developers. He asked if the final Plan will discuss parking more in detail.

Mr. Merrill indicated that the Final Plan would not discuss parking in detail and that it is their contention that there is quite a bit of parking in downtown Clayton. He stated that people are slowly beginning to change the way they think about cars, but that with residential development, people want two spaces per unit that are sectioned off and dedicated.

Mr. Hummel asked how the Plan will be used as an economic tool.

Mr. Moriarity indicated that Clayton has held its own very well and are getting Class A firms whose people will look for places to eat, get copies, etc. He stated that as far as residential goes, the quality of life Clayton has to offer helps draw residential development.

Mr. Merrill strongly suggested re-visiting the City’s zoning classifications to simplify them.

Alex Berger referred to the letter he wrote opposing the Plan’s approach regarding Shaw Park and its use as an economic tool. He stated that families come to the Park to play and that over 25,000 individuals per year use the tennis courts there.

Mr. Merrill stated that he appreciates the Park and respects it as a recreational facility and that their idea is long-term.

Dan O’Hollearn, developer of 6321 Southwood which was recently converted to condominiums, spoke to the members stating that this old building is now LEED Certified and that the up front costs are higher and financing more difficult than new construction.

Jason Jaggi indicated that the next step is to present this Plan to the Board of Aldermen, which will happen tomorrow evening and then some additional work sessions scheduled to refine the plan before it goes for public hearing.

Plan Commission Chairman Harold Sanger thanked everyone involved with the preparation of this Plan and closed this portion of the meeting. At 6:30 p.m., he called for a 5 minute break before the regular Plan Commission/ARB Meeting commences.

## MINUTES

### CITY PLAN COMMISSION/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

JUNE 21, 2010

The City Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board of the City of Clayton, Missouri, met upon the above date at 6:35 p.m., Chairman Harold Sanger presiding.

#### MINUTES

The minutes of the June 7, 2010 meeting were presented for approval. The minutes were approved, after having been previously distributed to each member.

#### SITE PLAN REVIEW/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – NEW CONSTRUCTION OF SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE – 57 BROADVIEW

Mr. George Johannes, project architect, Mr. Kim Hibbs, contractor and Patrick & Chris Win, owners, were in attendance at the meeting.

Jason Jaggi explained that he proposed project consists of a new 2 ½ story, approximately 29 feet in height, 6,053 square foot single family residence with an attached three-car garage. The site measures 10,074 square feet and is located in the Claverach Park Subdivision. An existing two-story house and detached garage will be removed to accommodate the proposed residence. The existing site contains 60.7% impervious area. The new plans show impervious coverage at 54.3% of the site with the removal and replacement of the existing residence, garage, driveway and patio. The existing storm water runoff is 0.694 cubic feet per second. Storm water runoff on the proposed site plan will decrease to 0.668 cubic feet per second (a difference of 0.026 CFS). Channel drains will be installed in the concrete driveway and patio. Yard drains will be installed in the rear yard with connections to the storm sewer. A swale will direct runoff from the southwest corner of the property along the southern side yard and into on-site drains. Plan notes indicate that the natural watercourse and patterns of drainage will not change and that no additional storm water will be introduced to neighboring properties with the proposed construction project. Trash will be stored in an enclosure at the rear of the driveway and screened by a wood fence. The applicant is proposing to use a geothermal HVAC system which will not require exterior mechanical equipment. Two deciduous ornamental trees totaling 15 caliper inches are to be removed and require replacement. Two street trees and two Oak trees on the subject property will remain and require protection. The applicant has submitted a detailed tree protection report prepared by a certified arborist for the 30-inch Shingle Oak. One ornamental tree will be relocated. The landscape plan provides a replacement of 42 caliper inches. Four deciduous ornamental trees and twelve broad-leaved evergreens are proposed as replacements. The landscape plan indicates that two plant beds and a replacement tree will be located in the area of the proposed swale and will need to be adjusted. Jason indicated that the proposed development represents a decrease in impervious coverage and storm water runoff. In addition, the site plan provides for storm water mitigation measures by introducing a side yard swale, yard drains, and a connection to the storm sewer to prevent the impact of increased run-off to adjacent properties. Tree protection is a concern, and the City's

contracted Landscape Architect should perform an inspection of the tree protection fencing prior to construction activity on the site. In addition, the applicant should follow the recommendations of the certified arborist and provide proof of completion of these measures to the City. Jason indicated that staff recommends approval as submitted with the following conditions:

1. That the plantings located within the swale along the southern edge of the subject property be relocated for staff review and approval.
2. That the City's contracted Landscape Architect perform a site inspection prior to commencement of construction activity to approve the tree protection fencing.
3. That the applicant follow the recommendations of the arborist's report to save the 30-inch oak tree and provide proof of completion of the mitigation measures to the City.

Mr. Johannes indicated that they believe the subject lot to be the smallest in Claverach Park and as such, had some zoning requirements that had to be dealt with, most notably the variance that was sought and approved for the below grade garage. He advised the members that the coverage of the site will be reduced to 54% from 61%.

Marc Lopata asked if the bricks on the existing house will be reused or if they will end up in a landfill.

Mr. Hibbs stated that they are currently discussing this matter and that most of the interior has been sold already. He stated that he is a certified green builder and this issue is of a big concern to him.

Chairman Sanger asked if storm water will be tied into the sewer system.

Mr. Johannes replied "yes".

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve the site plan per staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Marc Lopata and unanimously approved by the members.

The architectural aspects of the project were now up for review.

Jason Jaggi explained that the proposed home is a brown brick and stucco, 6,053 square foot (excluding basement area) 2 ½ story structure located in the Claverach Park Subdivision. The height of the proposed residence is 28'9" as measured from the average existing grade to the midpoint of the roof. The standing seam roof will be gray aluminum. Aluminum clad windows with wood interiors will be black in color. The roof will be standing seam metal, gray in color. Black aluminum-clad windows are proposed. Trash will be stored in an enclosure at the rear of the driveway and screened by a wood fence. The applicant is proposing to use a geothermal HVAC system which will not require exterior mechanical equipment. The attached, below grade, rear entry garage will have a tan colored recessed panel door. A variance was approved by the Board of Aldermen on May 6, 2010 for a 16 foot encroachment of the garage into the required 40 foot rear

yard setback. Claverach Park Trustee approval has been submitted. The appearance of the proposed structure is contemporary in nature which is a significant change from previously approved new houses in the neighborhood and, as such, the Architectural Review Board should carefully consider this design. To provide insight into the design and compatibility aspects of this new residence, the architect has provided a design narrative which is attached. Staff believes that the proposed design of the house is significantly more contemporary compared to other designs in the neighborhood. However, the common elements which tie this house to the others are the use of common materials (brick and stucco) and the proportions of the house. Staff would also note that the residential designs of homes located in Claverach Park vary greatly and do not reflect one particular style; rather, they are a collection of many different designs which use common materials and are proportionately similar. Staff also observes that the existing structure on this property does not contribute to the high quality housing design for which Claverach Park is known. The one particular aspect that concerns staff is the standing seam metal roofing material. Usually, these types of roofs are limited to porch roofs, dormers or other secondary roof locations. However, staff does not think that another roofing material such as architectural shingle or slate would be appropriate to the design of the house. With these considerations in mind, staff would recommend your favorable consideration of this proposed residence.

Mr. Johannes began a PowerPoint presentation. The first slide depicted a layout of Claverach Park and subsequent slides depicted floor plans of the proposed residence.

Mr. Johannes indicated that the Win's have two children and one on the way. He reiterated that the impervious coverage of the site is being reduced with the proposed construction, although the footprint is almost identical to what is there currently. He stated that the plan includes saving the 30" tree in the front and that an attempt was made to make this house LEED Certified, but the geothermal system makes it as "green" as possible.

Chairman Sanger asked that the design itself and how it is appropriate be discussed.

Mr. Johannes indicated that Claverach Park has a rich diversity of architectural styles, that many of the homes were built in the 1930s and that no two homes in the subdivision are identical. Slides depicting many of the subdivision homes as well as the existing structure and proposed structure on the subject lot were presented. Mr. Johannes stated that the proposed home is a more modern design.

Steve Lichtenfeld commented that it does look different, but that he finds it refreshing. He stated that he does have a bit of a concern with the sizes of the windows as they are very large in comparison; however, he likes the corner windows. He stated that overall, he finds the design refreshing and believes it will fit in nicely and that it appears they have gone to great lengths to fit it in and save the tree.

Jim Liberman agreed with Steve's comments. He stated that he, too, likes the design.

Marc Lopata commented that the roof is a great option as it is made from 80-90% recycled steel and high in quality.

Scott Wilson indicated that he found the slides of all the homes in Claverach Park very useful; however, he does not think this design seems like a great fit.

Mr. Johannes indicated that he has a written endorsement from the neighbors and Trustees and that all comments that have been received on this proposal have been positive.

Ron Reim indicated that he believes the house is a good fit for the neighborhood.

Chairman Sanger commented that he likes the house, he just does not like it in Clayton and does not believe it belongs here. He believes it crosses the line and he will vote against it. He referred to the Medve house (8331 University) that was constructed several years ago that sticks out like a sore thumb.

Marc Lopata commented that he believes others are on the fence about this design, but that Claverach Park is more about quality.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve as submitted. The motion was seconded by Marc Lopata and received the following roll call vote: Ayes: Steve Lichtenfeld, Craig Owens, Jim Liberman, Marc Lopata and Ron Reim. Nays: Chairman Sanger and Scott Wilson.

#### ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – ADDITION TO SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE – 903 S. MERAMEC AVENUE

Lauren Strutman, project architect, was in attendance at the meeting.

Jason Jaggi explained that the proposed addition measures 1,095 square feet and will raise the total size of the structure to 4,367 square feet. The size of the proposed addition is less than 50% of the size of the existing structure; therefore Site Plan Review is not required. Plans indicate that the height of the proposed addition will be 26'3" as measured from the existing grade to the peak of the roof. Staff estimates that the proposed addition will measure approximately 23' from the existing grade at the location of the proposed addition to the mid-point of the roof of the addition. The peak of the proposed addition is 1'5" lower than the peak of the existing roof. The existing residence is red brick with wood siding. The proposed addition will be constructed to match the existing with red brick and wood siding as a secondary material not exceeding 25% of the total area of any façade in accordance with Architectural Review Guidelines. The gray asphalt shingles on the roof of the proposed addition will match the existing. The existing attached, rear entry garage will remain. Double hung and casement windows are proposed on the addition and will be painted tan to match the existing. Two existing HVAC units are located in the side yard to the north. One will remain, and one will be relocated a few feet from its current location. Davis Place Trustee approval has been submitted. Jason stated that staff believes that the addition contains many of the details of the existing building and will match well. The proposed structure is in conformance with the R-2 Zoning District requirements for single-family residences and staff recommends that the project be approved as submitted with the following conditions:

- 1) That plans indicating adequate screening of HVAC units be submitted for staff approval prior to Building Permit issuance.



- 2) That plans indicating trash location and adequate screening be submitted for staff approval prior to Building Permit issuance.

Ms. Strutman informed the members that the contractor and the owners were in attendance this evening. She stated that this is a straight forward two story addition and that the brick, windows and roof will match that of the existing structure.

Marc Lopata asked if the issue of storm water is off limits.

Chairman Sanger replied “yes” as this is architectural review only.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if the neighbor to the south has approved the plans.

Mr. Mengwasser replied “yes”. He stated that the neighbors as well as the Trustees are pleased with the project.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve per staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Ron Reim and unanimously approved by the Board.

#### ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – MONUMENT SIGN – 150 N. MERAMEC AVENUE

Joe Natale with Engraphix, sign contractor, was in attendance at the meeting.

Jason Jaggi explained that the applicant is proposing to remove an existing monument sign at the northwest corner of the subject property and replace it with a new monument sign, although the brick and limestone base will remain. The proposed black and olive green aluminum sign will have internally illuminated white plex lettering. On both sides of the proposed monument sign, the property address will be indicated at the top and 3 changeable tenant sign panels for the office building at the subject property will be positioned below. The total sign including the property address measures 5’ tall by 4’ wide with an area of 20 square feet. The proposed sign meets the commercial ground sign 25 square foot size and 5 tenant allocation provided in the Sign Ordinance. The proposed monument sign will be slightly taller than the existing sign in its location and will indicate the property address and additional tenants. Ground mounted up lights will be replaced by internal illumination. The proposed monument sign is consistent with existing commercial signage in the surrounding area and staff recommends approval as submitted with the following conditions:

- 1) That the landscaped area surrounding the proposed sign be maintained; and
- 2) That the applicant apply for and receive a Sign Permit prior to installation.

Mr. Natale indicated that the proposed sign is an upgrade to what is existing. A sample sign depicting the illumination was presented. He stated that green accents to correspond with the building’s trim was incorporated into the sign (color shown).

Marc Lopata asked if there will be a cleaning problem with the push out letters.

Mr. Natale replied “no”.

Marc Lopata asked if it is the responsibility of the building manager to clean the sign.

Mr. Natale indicated that it just requires a simple wipe down. He mentioned that the old sign will be recycled.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve per staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Ron Reim and unanimously approved by the Board.

#### ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – MONUMENT SIGN - 7710 CARONDELET

Don Ferguson, building owner, was in attendance at the meeting.

Jason Jaggi explained that this is consideration of a request for review of the design and materials associated with the installation of a monument sign at the northeast corner of the subject site. The applicant is proposing to construct a wedge shaped structure of porcelain tile with a granite-like appearance which stands 7 feet tall and 7 feet wide. A metal sign box measuring 3 feet wide by 4’6” tall with an area of 13.5 square feet will be mounted to either side of the porcelain wedge. Five tenant names will be internally illuminated on both faces of the sign box. The property address will be indicated by metal numbers on pins which stand off of the wedge structure above the sign box. The proposed monument sign will not extend beyond the face of the existing building and is shown to be located on private property. Many existing monument signs in the surrounding area are shorter than the proposed 7 foot tall wedge-shaped structure to which the sign box will be mounted. However, the sign box of the proposed sign meets the commercial ground sign 25 square foot size and 5 tenant allocation provided in the Sign Ordinance. The porcelain tile on the wedge structure will match the retaining wall and base of the existing office building on the subject site. Jason stated that staff recommends approval as submitted with the following conditions:

- 1) That the landscaped area surrounding the proposed sign be maintained; and
- 2) That the applicant apply for and receive a Sign Permit prior to installation.

Mr. Ferguson asked if there were any questions regarding the proposal.

Chairman Sanger commented that he is struggling with where the sign is actually being placed.

Mr. Ferguson indicated that it is going to be on the eastern side of the building in front of the parking lot. He stated that the granite will match.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve per staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Jim Liberman and unanimously approved by the Board.

## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – SIGNAGE SUB-DISTRICT-CENTENE PLAZA – 7700 FORSYTH BLVD.

Dan O'Connor with the Koman Group, developer, was in attendance at the meeting.

Jason explained that in compliance with the approval of the project, the applicant has developed sign specifications for ground floor commercial tenants of the parking garage and Phase I office tower, a multi-tenant monument sign for the office tower, and a directory monument sign to be placed within the Forsyth Court plaza. The following signage is proposed:

### **Centene Plaza Phase I Office Tower**

#### **1. Multi-Tenant Monument Sign**

An 18-foot tall by 3-feet wide monument sign is proposed to be placed at the entry to the Forsyth Courtyard. The proposed sign will be externally illuminated, the details of which have not been provided. The material of the proposed sign will be satin-finished stainless steel. The Centene Plaza text will be lightly etched into the face of the sign. Four (4) tenant names are shown on the sign and will be silkscreened onto the sign. In addition, the address and the developer's name is featured on the bottom portion of the sign.

#### **2. Ground Floor Tenant Wall Signs**

A total of four (4) signs are proposed for the ground floor tenants located within the Phase I Centene Office Tower. One sign will face Hanley Road, two signs will face Forsyth and a single sign will face into the Forsyth Court area on the west side of the tower. These signs will contain 10-feet wide by 9.5-feet tall hanging satin steel panels. The sign area depicting the name/logo of the tenant will be limited to 15 percent of the surface area of the panel. The UMB Bank example shown is 10-square feet.

### **Directional Monument Signs—Forsyth Court**

A total of three (3) pedestrian-scaled directional monument signs are proposed within the Forsyth Court area. The signs are similar to what you would find in a mall and thus functions as a commercial tenant directory. These 1.3 feet by 7-feet tall signs will be finished to match the tower aluminum-clad columns.

### **Parking Structure Commercial Tenants**

#### **1. Garage Retail Canopies**

A woven wall canopy system is proposed to be located above the commercial spaces at the base of the parking garage. This system features mesh woven through stainless cables which will be illuminated at night. This canopy system is proposed in lieu of traditional awnings above the storefronts.

## 2. Storefront Signage

The main storefront identification is proposed to be a canvas fabric “banner” structure. These banners will extend above each storefront entry and will be placed behind the woven wall canopy system. These panels will measure 6.5 feet wide by 17-feet tall. The sign area allocated for each tenant is limited to a 4-foot by 4-foot area within the banners. Varying colors for the banners are shown; however, a specific color palette has not been provided. Similar to The Crescent building, blade signs are proposed adjacent to each storefront entry and will measure 2-feet square. These signs will be lit from above and will be faced with stainless steel.

Jason indicated that because this signage is unique to the development, staff did not review the proposal based on standard sign allowances as provided in the City’s Sign Regulations. The intent of the formation of a sign sub-district is to allow a sign package which fosters creativity and cohesiveness for larger developments. The most recent sign sub-district approved by the ARB is The Crescent building which staff finds to be complimentary to the building and surrounding environment. Similarly, this proposed sign sub-district represents a contemporary approach to signage which is reflective of the design of the improvements on the site. The hanging sign panels located at the base of the office tower are very large; however, the sign area is limited to a reasonable portion of these panels. The multi-colored fabric banners above the commercial storefronts will create interest along the streetscape as will the unique woven wall canopy system. Together, with the Ned Kahn Wind Veil, the garage will have a distinctive look all its own. Staff does; however, have concerns with the proportions of the proposed multi-tenant monument sign. This sign is very tall (18-feet) but is only 3-feet wide. The result of this configuration is the small text size for the tenant names. Additional office identification signs are not proposed. Staff would prefer a shorter and wider sign to provide the appropriate space for lettering. Jason indicated that staff’s recommendation is to approve as submitted with the following conditions:

1. That the Sign Standards be filed with the St. Louis County Recorder of Deeds and that proof of filing be provided to staff.
2. That the applicant apply for and receive a sign permit for each sign prior to installation and that all signage be approved by the City consistent with the sign sub-district standards.
3. That the applicant reduce the height of the multi-tenant monument sign and increase the width to improve functionality for Architectural Review Board approval.

Chairman Sanger asked if they have a tenant yet.

Mr. O’Connor replied “yes, Armstrong Teasdale”.

Mr. O’Connor began a PowerPoint presentation. He stated that the multi-tenant monument sign has been revised to be 14’ tall X 4’ wide per staff recommendation. He stated that there are three directional signs – one at the entrance to the garage; one at the entrance to the

tower and one at the top of the south stair. Mr. O'Connor then briefly discussed the canopy proposal, the colored banners (LED behind the fabric) and the 2 X 2 blade signs.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if there is no weather protection for the tenant signs.

Mr. O'Connor indicated that is correct. He stated that the entry doors are set back about 3 ½ feet.

Ron Reim referred to the varying banner colors. He asked if there was any rhyme or reason to the colors.

Mr. O'Connor replied "no"; he added that they are fairly flexible with the colors.

Steve Lichtenfeld referred to Page 17, asking if the names depicted are indicative of the future retail tenants.

Mr. O'Connor replied "no".

Steve Lichtenfeld stated that he likes the tall, thin sign, asking if it would flex in the wind.

Mr. O'Connor replied "no".

Jason Jaggi indicated that it is by far the tallest monument sign in Clayton.

Jim Liberman asked for confirmation that there are no proposed signs up high on the building.

Mr. O'Connor concurred.

Scott Wilson commented that there is a lot going on, but he is happy with the proposal.

Chairman Sanger stated that a pedestrian would like to be protected from the rain.

Mr. O'Connor indicated that 75 feet is the longest anyone would have to walk without weather protection.

Craig Owens commented that there are a lot of different patterns here.

Mr. O'Connor indicated that everyone involved in this project (the developer, the architect, the artist) collaborated and all have approved the signage.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve per staff recommendations (note that includes the shorter monument sign (14' X 4') as presented at this meeting). The motion was seconded by Marc Lopata and unanimously approved by the Board.

## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – STAIR TOWER-CENTENE PLAZA – 7700 FORSYTH BLVD.

Dan O'Connor with the Koman Group, developer, was in attendance at the meeting.

Jason Jaggi explained that this is a request for consideration of the design and materials associated with a new stair tower on the south side of the Forsyth Court outside plaza. This stair tower was not a part of the Architectural Review Board's most recently approved plans for the Phase I Sub-District of the Centene Plaza Special Development District project. The stair tower is proposed in lieu of a more elaborate connection from Forsyth Court to Carondelet Avenue previously proposed by the developer, referring to a drawing. The applicant indicates that this stair tower will be temporary until the Phase 2 Office Tower is completed. The illustrations depict a park area at the site of the future Phase 2 Office Tower. This park has yet to be fully designed and will require approvals by the Architectural Review Board and Board of Aldermen at a later date as an amendment to the Special Development District plan. The stair tower is comprised of a cast-in-place concrete pylon with concrete stair risers. The handrail will be painted steel rail with ½" diameter pipes. For illumination, there will be recessed LED fixtures at each of the landings. A walkway leading through the proposed park as well as a walkway along the north-south alley will provide access to the stair tower. The proposal represents a minimal approach for providing a connection to the Forsyth Court area from Carondelet Avenue; however, it is important to note that Phase 2 will incorporate an extension of the Forsyth Court plaza feature which will provide access to Hanley. The developer has also indicated that this stair tower is a temporary access connection to Carondelet until Phase 2 is built. Staff recommends approval of this stair tower with the understanding that this stair tower is temporary and will be removed in favor of a more appropriate connection from Carondelet to the Forsyth Court outdoor plaza. Jason stated that staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. That this stair tower serve as a temporary pedestrian connection from Carondelet Avenue to the Forsyth Court until Phase 2 is completed.
2. That the proposed park contain plant material at the base of the stair tower to provide a visual relief.

Chairman Sanger asked if this meets ADA.

Jason Jaggi stated that is not required for this proposal.

Mr. O'Connor began a PowerPoint presentation.

Chairman Sanger asked the status of Phase II.

Mr. O'Connor indicated that nothing is in the works at this time for Phase II.

Scott Wilson asked what happens if Phase II is never constructed.

Ron Reim asked the definition of “temporary”.

Scott Wilson asked if this gets revisited if Phase II is cancelled.

Chairman Sanger suggested revisiting in 3 years or so.

Jason Jaggi indicated that staff approached this as temporary, but that it does provide a connection to Carondelet.

Mr. O’Connor reminded the members the cost Centene incurred for the addition to the garage and their intent/commitment to build Phase II.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve per staff recommendations, that it be revisited by this Board in five (5) years at which time a decision will be made to either extend the approval or require removal of the structure, either way, this approval expires five years from today’s date. The motion was seconded by Scott Wilson and unanimously approved by the Board.

Jason Jaggi announced that the conceptual presentation of the proposed project at the corner of Clayton and Hanley Roads has been postponed at the request of the applicant. He stated that he anticipates it re-appearing on the agenda the second meeting in July.

Marc Lopata asked if the park design will also come to this Board for approval.

Jason Jaggi replied “yes”.

Chairman Sanger informed everyone that he will be out of town on July 6<sup>th</sup> so he will not be able to attend the next meeting.

Being no further business for the Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board, this meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

---

Recording Secretary